DRAFT

2006 to 2008 STIP Criteria & Project Nomination Request

Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
Division of Program Development

Review Package for Public Comments
August 2004

Comments and Project Nominations due: October 8, 2004

Where to send comments and project nominations

Comments on the draft STIP criteria and match policy should be sent as follows:

2006-2008 STIP Comments Alaska DOT&PF 3132 Channel Drive Room 200 Juneau, AK 99801-7898

or email:

STIP@dot.state.ak.us

or by fax: 888 PLANFAX (888-752-6329) toll-free 465-6984 (in Juneau)

If questions: 888 PLAN DOT (888 752-6368) toll free 465-4070 (in Juneau)

Project nominations should be sent to the appropriate regional planning office at the appropriate address:

Northern Region Planning Office Alaska DOT&PF 2301 Peger Road Fairbanks, AK 99709-5316

Central Region Planning Office Alaska DOT&PF PO Box 196900 Anchorage, AK 99519-6900

Southeast Region Planning Office Alaska DOT&PF 6860 Glacier Highway Juneau, AK 99801-7999

Remember, comments and nominations are due October 8, 2004.

A map is provided in this package that helps identify which region your community is located within.

Proposed changes to STIP criteria

The changes proposed in the following pages are focused on a few key questions within each set of criteria rather than a wholesale change to all the questions. We have identified certain questions that were not helping define meaningful distinction between projects and have worked to make them work in a more constructive manner. The following changes are proposed:

Economic Benefits

This question has been modified to consider both costs and benefits of projects in order to ensure the criteria fulfill the requirements of state law governing transportation planning [AS 44.42.050 (a)]. Projects will be given maximum points when they have a high level of monetary benefits that exceed costs whereas projects with fewer benefits will receive fewer points on the scale. Projects lacking such a formal analysis will score zero points.

The changes to the economics benefits question apply to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question #1) and Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #1).

Safety Questions

One change applies to the manner of assigning points for "safety" which has been scored almost universally high in recent years. In doing so the question has lost significance. Under the change, projects with a documented history of significant safety problems will get a maximum number of points, and speculative and lesser safety issues will be scored lower on the scale.

The changes to the safety question apply to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question #3), Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #3) and Transit Projects criteria (question #2).

Other Factors Not Specified Questions

Another noted problem in the STIP scoring process was the use of the question rating "Other factors not specified." This question has lost meaning as most projects received maximum scores. This means that the question does not fairly distinguish between more deserving and less deserving projects.

Under the proposed change each PEB member would be allocated a maximum pool of points to be applied to this question. Each project in a

STIP category would add 2 points to the pool, and the scorer can assign between 0-5 points to any single project, subject to the maximum number in the pool. If there were ten projects being considered, the PEB member could allocate not more than 20 points (10 projects x 2 points). If 4 projects were then given 5 points (4 x 5 = 20), then all other projects he or she scored would receive 0 points. The proposed change would ensure that this question is not routinely scored at a high level. Negative points may also be used to address projects that are of excessive scope, budget or have other negative factors.

The proposed change to the "other factors" question applies to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question # 13), Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #15), TRAAK Projects criteria (question #11), and Transit Projects criteria (question # 13).

Project Sponsor Questions

Another change is the scoring for cash or in-kind contributions from the project sponsor. With the new match policy now in place requiring match from non-state sponsors for many projects, the required match amounts would not be credited. Only contributions over the required sponsor match amount would be considered in scoring.

The proposed change to the "project sponsor" question applies to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question # 5), Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #5), TRAAK Projects criteria (question #3a and 3b), and Transit Projects criteria (question # 4), and Intelligent Transportation Projects criteria (question #5).

Functional Classification Question

In the Rural and Urban Projects criteria, question #14 was changed to significantly favor higher functional class routes. The points assigned to lower functional class roads including minor collectors and local roads was reduced. This was done to reflect the need to redirect scarce transportation funds to those roads that are important to the state's network of most significant roads.

Cost Effectiveness Question

In the Rural and Urban criteria, question #11 was changed. This question attempts to measure the most cost effective projects by mathematically calculating the cost per mile, per average daily traffic served. Previously we used fixed dollar amounts for each possible score, from +5 to -5 points. Under the new approach, all projects would be calculated, and then sorted into 11 "bins." Each bin would receive an

approximately equal number of projects in rank order. This approach ensures even distribution of the points and can readily adjust to dollar levels that may change due to unforeseen cost and inflation factors. It guarantees that all 11 score bins will be used in an equitable manner.

Equalizing possible weight and points between competing STIP categories

Maximum weight for each STIP category

Several of the STIP scoring categories result in projects competing for the same limited funds, though they are scored using different sets of criteria. If the maximum number of points is different there is a significant inequity in making such comparisons. In particular, the Rural and Urban Projects criteria suffered from this disadvantage. For example, there are pairs of questions that are either/or. If you answer one of these questions, then the points cannot be assigned for the other question in the pair. This practically reduces the maximum total weight for these criteria.

Throughout several of the criteria, the weights were adjusted to make all criteria that compete for the same funds, equal in terms of the maximum weight that can be assigned. In a few cases questions were rearranged and combined to make the total weight possible in each STIP category more readily understandable.

Maximum points for sponsor contribution questions

Certain questions on local sponsor contributions were modified to reflect the maximum number of points that can be earned for local contribution to 5 instead of 20. By making up to 15 possible bonus points on these questions, projects not on the state network can readily score much higher than state-owned road and highway projects, skewing scarce funding away from the primary network of transportation routes. This change now makes local sponsored projects compete without an unfair advantage.

The proposed change to the "sponsor contribution" question maximum points applies to the Transit Projects criteria (question #4) and in the Intelligent Transportation Projects criteria (question #5).

Why TRAAK project nominations are not being called for?

Changes to the TRAAK criteria are proposed simply to remain consistent with changes being made to other STIP categories. This program has been greatly reduced by legislation passed in 2003 (AS 19.15.025). The change had the effect of substantially reducing the amounts of funds that can be used for projects in the TRAAK program. This reduction, coupled with a large number of projects already begun requires we focus limited funding on those projects ready for construction, at least through the 2008 year. With no funding to spend on new TRAAK projects, there is no purpose to either seek nominations or score them. The new state law, passed in 2003, reads:

AS 19.15.025

(a) Before October 1, 2006, the department may annually allocate up to four percent of nonrestricted federal-aid highway apportionments to projects classified under the trails and recreational access for Alaska program under a statewide transportation improvement program. On or after October 1, 2006, the department may allocate up to two percent of nonrestricted federal-aid highway apportionments to projects classified under the trails and recreational access for Alaska program under a statewide transportation improvement program."

As required by this law, the department must shrink spending on the TRAAK program by 75% as compared to 2003 and previously. This change in law is being reflected in project selection for the STIP and means there is no room for new TRAAK nominations for several years.

Format of changes to STIP criteria

Proposed changes in the criteria follow this format:

New language is shown as italics.

Deleted language is shown in strike-through.

Remote and Trail	Projects Criteria				
	·		Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. Economic	Supports economic	Supports capacity or	Supports minimal,	N/A	N/A
benefits following	benefit; endorsed in	new access	speculative or		
construction.	an economic	specifically built to	temporary economic		
	development project	support regional or	opportunities or		
	by regional	local industrial,	benefits or provides		
	governmental agency	commercial or	non-crucial benefit to		
	or representative	resource	existing economic		
Weighting: 4	group.	development	activity.		
1. Economic	Consideration of an an	alysis of costs and bene	fits demonstrates:	N/A	N/A
benefits.	project has very	project has above	project has below		
	significant monetary	average monetary	average monetary		
	benefits.	benefits.	benefits; or no		
		(Score typical or	documentation		
Weighting: 2		average benefits = 2)	provided.		
Economic benefits an	alysis shall not consider		onstruction.		
2. Health and	This project provides	This project provides	Project will have no	This project provides	This project provides
quality of life	a significant	a moderate	effect either positive	a moderate	a significant
(Air and water	contribution to	contribution to	or negative on quality	degradation to health	degradation to health
quality,	improved health or	improved health or	of life issues.	or quality of life.	or quality of life.
neighborhood	quality of life, or	quality of life, or			
continuity, access to	reduces or removes a	reduces or removes			
basic necessities)	significant existing	an existing negative			
Weighting: 5	negative factor.	factor.			
Examples: Access to	basic sanitation = 5; dus	st control = 4 5; access			
3. Safety.	Addresses	Addresses	Less than 5% of	N/A	N/A
	demonstrated safety	demonstrated safety	project addresses		
	problem of	problem of moderate	safety.		
	significance.	nature or there is a			
		record of public			
Weighting: 5		concern.			
3. Safety.	Strongly addresses a	Addresses	No record of safety	N/A	N/A
	significant and	demonstrated	issues addressed by		
	existing safety	existing safety	project or it is not		
	problem.	problem of moderate	primary purpose of		
Weighting: 5		nature.	project.		
10 year record: 2 or m	nore deaths or major inju	ries = 5; 1 major injury =	3; speculative or anecdo	otal safety problem = ma	ximum points 2.

Remote and Trail	Projects Criteria				
_			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
4. Improves	Greatly improves the	Moderately improves	Minimal or no effect	Moderately	Greatly decreases
intermodal	connectivity between	the connectivity	on transportation	decreases the	the connectivity
transportation or	modes and	between modes and	system connectivity,	connectivity between	between modes or
lessens redundant	coordination and	enhances	or coordination and	modes or decreases	decreases
facilities.	integration of	coordination and	integration of	coordination and	coordination and
	passenger and freight	integration of	passenger and freight	integration of	integration of
	systems and services and/or would clearly	passenger and freight systems and/or would	systems and services and does not change	passenger and freight systems and/or would	passenger and freight systems and/or would
	reduce the need for	clearly reduce the	the requirement for	clearly require the	clearly require the
	significant capital	need for moderate	investment in other	need for moderate	need for significant
	investment in another	capital investment in	modes.	capital investment in	capital investment in
Weighting: 2	mode.	another mode.	1110000.	another mode.	another mode.
5. Local, other	Contribution of state ma		Contribution covers	N/A	N/A
agency or user	way, and/or materials:		no capital costs;		1777
contribution to fund	of project cost.		contributes nothing.		
capital costs.					
Weighting: 2 4					
	te match policy shall not	be considered In this qu	estion. Only contribution	ns that exceed the requir	ed match contribution
shall be considered.	T				
6. Local, other	Sponsor will assume	Sponsor will assume	Sponsor contributes	N/A	N/A
agency or user	ownership if currently	full M&O	nothing.		
contribution to fund	a DOT&PF facility; or	responsibility; or	Cantinuad an anan		
M&O costs. (For	sponsor will assume	sponsor will assume full M&O of another	Continued sponsor ownership &		
non-DOT or DOT unsuited to long-	ownership of another DOT&PF facility of	DOT&PF facility of	operation of locally-		
term ownership).	similar M&O cost.	similar M&O cost.	owned facility = 1 pt.;		
teriii ownersiiip).	Similar Mac Cost.	Similar Mac Cost.	And results in		
			significant local		
			maintenance savings		
Weighting: 5			= 2 pts.		
STIP commitment mu	st be in writing and pass	ed by the governing bod	y of the community or tril	be before points will be a	ssigned.
7. Departmental	Very high M&O	Moderate M&O	Not an M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority;	Not an M&O priority;
M&O priority (Use	priority.	priority.		would increase M&O	would increase M&O
for DOT&PF				costs moderately.	costs significantly.
facilities.)					
Weighting: 5					

Remote and Trail	Projects Criteria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
8. Public support.	Preponderance of	Majority of public	Public record is	Majority of public	Preponderance of
	public record	record shows support	divided or	record shows	public record shows
	including a resolution	for project; and	undocumented	opposition to project;	opposition to project
	from the local elected	nominally supported	toward project	and not supported in	including a resolution
	body shows support	in official state/local		official state/local	from the local elected
	for project and fully supported in official	plans.		plans.	body and contravenes official
Weighting: 3	state/local plans.				state/local plans.
9. Environmental	Environmental	Environmental	Environmental	Environmental	Environmental
approval readiness	approval likely with	approval likely with	approval likely with	approval extremely	approval unlikely.
approvar readiness	Categorical Exclusion	Environmental	Environmental Impact	difficult 50/50 chance.	approvar armitory.
	or already complete.	Assessment or draft	Statement.		
Weighting: 2		documents			
0 0		circulated.			
Will project	New access to two or	New access to one =	None of uses listed.	N/A	N/A
provide new and/or	more uses = 5.	3;			
improved access		Improved access to			
to the noted uses:		two or more = 2;			
water sources,		Improved access to			
landfills, sewage		one of listed uses = 1.			
lagoons/honey bucket sites, health		1.			
care, airports,					
subsistence sites, or					
river/ocean access?					
Weighting: 5					
11. System	Major purpose of	Secondary purpose	Preservation is not	N/A	N/A
preservation.	project is to extend	of project is to extend	significant purpose of		
	the life of existing	life of existing facility	the project.		
	facility by 10 or more	by 10 or more years.			
Weighting: 3	years.	ALIA	N	N1/A	NI/A
12. Is this a joint	Yes.	N/A	No.	N/A	N/A
project with ADEC,					
BIA or PHS?					
Weighting: 4					

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria									
			Scoring Criteria						
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)				
13. Other factors	Project exhibits	Project exhibits	Project exhibits no	N/A	N/A				
not specified.	significant innovation,	moderate innovation,	innovation, creativity						
	creativity or unique	creativity or unique	or unique benefits not						
	benefits not	benefits not	otherwise rated.						
Weighting: 2	otherwise rated.	otherwise rated.							
13. Other factors		allocated 2 points for eac		Negative points may b	e assigned to projects				
not specified.	Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" that are excessive in scope, cos				cope, cost or deemed				
		Remote, Rural/Urban an		not in state's interest.					
Weighting: 2	categories must be use	ed for projects within the	same category.						

Total Weight = 47

Urban and Rural	Projects Criteria				
Orban and Kurar	Frojecis Criteria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. Economic	Supports significant	Supports moderate	Supports minimal,	N/A	N/A
benefits following	new, identifiable.	new, identifiable,	speculative or	14/74	1077
construction.	permanent economic	permanent economic	temporary economic		
	opportunities or	opportunities or	opportunities or		
	benefits of statewide	benefits of regional or	benefits or provides		
	or interstate scope.	local scope.	non-crucial benefit to		
	·	·	existing economic		
Weighting: 2			activity.		
1. Economic	Consideration of an an	alysis of costs and bene	fits demonstrates:	N/A	N/A
benefits.	project has very	project with above	project with below		
	significant monetary	average monetary	average monetary		
	benefits.	benefits.	benefits; or no		
		(Score typical or	documentation		
Weighting: 5		average benefits = 2)	provided.		
	alysis shall not consider				1
2. Health and	This project provides	This project provides	Project will have no	This project provides	This project provides
quality of life	a significant	a moderate	effect either positive	a moderate	a significant
(Air and water	contribution to	contribution to	or negative on quality	degradation to health	degradation to health
quality,	improved health or	improved health or	of life issues.	or quality of life.	or quality of life.
neighborhood	quality of life, or	quality of life, or			
continuity, access to	reduces or removes a	reduces or removes			
basic necessities)	significant existing	an existing negative			
Weighting: 1	negative factor.	factor.		21/2	
3. Safety.	HSIP priority = 5	5% - 20% = 1	Less than 5% of	N/A	N/A
	60% - 80% = 4	20% - 40% = 2	project addresses		
Weighting: 5	80% - 100% = 5	40% - 60% = 3	safety.		
3. Safety.	Strongly addresses a	Addresses	No record of safety	N/A	N/A
	significant and	demonstrated	issues addressed by		
	existing safety	existing safety	project or it is not		
Maiodetinos. C	problem.	problem of moderate	primary purpose of		
Weighting: 5	anno de ette e en mario d'al	nature.	project.	atal a afatu muahlams	view was a sinda O
าบ year record: 2 or n	nore deaths or major inju	ries = 5; 1 major injury =	ਤ; speculative or anecdo	otai satety problem = ma	ximum points 2.

the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Weighting: 2-3 Weighting: 2-3 Contribution of state match, design, right-of-gency or user contribution to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered. When the need for capital investment in another mode requiring additional result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Sa. Local, other Sponsor will assume Sponsor contributes N/A N/A on another mode requiring additional capital expenditure. On the mode possibly requiring additional capital expenditure. On another mode requir	Urban and Rural	Projects Criteria				
Istandards I. Improves In Improves I. Improve I. Improves I. Improve Intervention In						
I. Improves mithermodal methodal transportation or essens redundant animestment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. S. Local, other agency or user each \$ 20% of project cost. Weighting: 4 Wald clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution to to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 Wald clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution covers not specific to state match, design, right-ofway, and/or materials: ne-peint limit – 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. Weighting: 4 Wald costs. Weighting: 4 Wald increase demand on another mode requirements. Verquiring additional capital expenditure. Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing. Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing. Sponsor will assume full M&O cost. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility or similar M&O cost. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently and M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. N/A Woderate M&O priority. Not an M&O priority. Not an M&O priority. Not an M&O costs significantly. Not an M&O costs significantly.						
the need for capital investment in another mode arransportation or dessens redundant acilities. weighting: 2-3 Meighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered. Baccal, other shall be considered. Baccal, other contribution to tomal M&O costs. For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to nong-term symenship.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Title commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority. Wolded moder at Not an M&O posity. Other mode requirements. In other requirements. In other requirements. In other requirements. other mode posity preduction in operating costs by reduction in operating cost	Standards	(5)		(0)	(-3)	(-5)
in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution to the dapital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered. Sale Local, other agency or user connection between shall be considered. Sale Local, other agency or user connection between shall be considered. Sale Local other agency or user connection between shall be considered. Sale Local other agency or user connection between shall be considered. Sale Local other agency or user connection between shall be considered to ong-term workship; of ong-term connection between shall be considered to ong-term contribution to similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; and or of Significantly. Octsts in mode possibly requiring additional requiring additional capital expenditure. Weighting: 2-3 or freight. Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing. N/A Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsuited to ong-term ownership of another poor titll M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.	Improves					Will increase demand
mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Sal Local, other agency or user contribution to und M&O costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility or sponsor will assume ownership.) Sponsor will assume ownership.) Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority, little effect on M&O costs moderately. Weighting: 0 or 5	intermodal					
reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Local, other agency or user contribution to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 M&O costs. Ba Local, other spency or user each \$ 20% of project cost. Sponsor will assume of spency or user each \$ 20% of project cost. Sponsor will assume of spency or user each \$ 20% of project cost. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Sponsor will assume ownership.) Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 SITIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority. Not an M&O priority. Not an M&O priority. Not an M&O priority. Weighting: 0 or 5 N/A N/A Sponsor will assume ownership in to winting and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority. Not an M&O priority. Would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution covers no capital costs; contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing. Sponsor contributions that exceed the required match contribution sthat exceed the required match contribution sthat exceed the required match contribution sthat exceed the required match contribution ownership in an application of locally ownership in a significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts. Sponsor will assume ownership in a contribution of locally owned facility = 1 pt. And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/				requirements.		
costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. 5. Local, other agency or user contribution to und Aging and passed by the governing body of the communitient must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe effect on M&O costs and oriority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weightling: 0 or 5 Reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/						capital expenditure.
redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight. 5. Local, other agency or user contribution to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions to und M&O costs. 6a. Local, other gency or user contribution to und Capital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of project cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of another DOT usuited to possons will assume full M&O another DOT another DOT way, and way and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. 5a. Local, other way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each \$ 20% of another DOT	facilities.				capital expenditure.	
weighting: 2-3 Weighting: 2-3 S. Local, other agency or user contribution to und dapital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution to und M&O costs. For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to ong-term ownership.) Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Wey high M&O priority. Would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Sponsor will assume full M&O another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Moderate M&O priority. Would increase M&O costs significantly.						
improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution of state match, design, right-ofway, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each 5 20% of project cost. Contribution to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsulted to ong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority, would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs significantly. Not an M&O costs significantly. Not and so priority. Would increase M&O costs significantly.						
Connection between modes for travelers or freight. Contribution of state match, design, right-of-gency or user soft and the state of the considered. Contribution to the considered in the						
Weighting: 2-3 or freight. To Contribution to und capital costs. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. So. Local, other each 5 20% of project cost. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Sort on the policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5						
Weighting: 2-3 or freight. Or freight. Contribution of state match, design, right-ofway, and/or materials: no-point limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered in this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. So. Local, other each § 20% of project cost. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of song-term ownership.) Sponsor will assume full M&O cost. Sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. F. 6b. Departmental Very high M&O priority. M&O costs and priority (Use for DOT selection of state match, design, right-of-way, not capital costs; contribution store and the very contribution store						
Contribution of state match, design, right-of- way, and/or materials: no point limit — 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Sa. Local, other agency or user contribution to und M&O costs. Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsuited to ong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. N/A N/A N/A Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Some ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs significantly. Not an M&O costs significantly. Not an M&O costs moderately.	Weighting: 2. 3					
way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. way, and/or materials: no peint limit – 1 pt per each § 20% of project cost. not capital costs; contributes nothing. Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. OT accitioned sponsor ownership & operation of locally an an intenance savings = 2 pts. STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately.	5. Local, other		<u> </u>	Contribution covers	N/A	N/A
each \$ 20% of project cost. Contributes nothing.	•					
Weighting: 4 Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Sa. Local, other agency or user contribution to und M&O costs. For non-DOT or DOT or DOT unsuited to ong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/	contribution to					
Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Sa. Local, other agency or user contribution to und M&O costs. For non-DOT or DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Sponsor will assume full M&O another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts. STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/	fund capital costs.	, ,				
Scale Local, other agency or user contribution to a DOT&PF facility, or sonsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility, or sonsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsuited to cong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5	Weighting: 4					
Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O costs. Weighting: 0 or 5	Match required by sta	nte match policy shall not	be considered In this qu	estion. Only contribution	ns that exceed the requi	red match contribution
ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsuited to ong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weod costs and oriority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately.	shall be considered.					
a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsuited to cong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Wood costs and priority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately.	6a. Local, other			•	N/A	N/A
sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT unsuited to ong-term ownership.) Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Word have a sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weoderate M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs moderately. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5	agency or user			nothing.		
For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: Weighting: 0 or 5 OVERPF facility of similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5						
DOT unsuited to ong-term similar M&O cost. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: Wery high M&O costs and priority. Weighting: 0 or 5 DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost. And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs and oriority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5						
where ship.) Similar M&O cost.	`					
Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5 The commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts. Not an M&O priority; little effect on M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.						
Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Strip commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs. Would increase M&O costs moderately. Weighting: 0 or 5		similar M&O cost.	similar M&O cost.			
Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. A 6b. Departmental Very high M&O priority. M&O costs and priority. M&O costs and priority. DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 Maintenance savings = 2 pts. Not an M&O priority before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Would increase M&O costs significantly.	ownersnip.)					
Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. 7- 6b. Departmental Priority. M&O costs and Priority: Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Weighting: 0 or 5 STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O costs moderately.						
STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned. 7. 6b. Departmental Very high M&O priority. M&O costs and priority. Priority. Moderate M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs. DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5	Maighting: Oar E					
Was Coosts and priority: Weighting: 0 or 5 Wey high M&O priority: Moderate M&O priority: Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately. Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately.	0	 ust be in writing and pass	ed by the governing had	•	he hefere points will be	essigned
M&O costs and priority. priority. priority. little effect on M&O costs moderately. would increase M&O costs moderately. would increase M&O costs moderately. would increase M&O costs significantly.						
oriority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5 Costs moderately. costs significantly.						
OOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5		priority.	priority.			
Weighting: $0 \text{ or } 5$				00010.	oosis moderatory.	doors significantly.
	,					
JUESTIONS #D & #7 TO DE FEIADEIEG #DA & DD - USE DA OF DD - DOT DOTD - All OTDEF GUESTIONS TO DE FENUMDEREG IN TIDAL GRAft		be relabeled #6a & 6b	Use 6a or 6b, not both	All other questions to be	renumbered in final draf	it

Urban and Rural	Projects Criteria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
8. Public support? Weighting: 3	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official state or local plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project; and nominally supported in official state or local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project; and not supported in official state or local plans.	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official state/local plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and/or contravenes official state/local plans.
9. Environmental approval readiness? Weighting: 2	Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion or already complete.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment or draft document circulated.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval extremely difficult 50/50 chance.	Environmental approval unlikely.
10. Surface rehabilitation. or deficient width/grade/alignment (w/g/a). Weighting: 4 5	Primarily 3-R and a PMS recommendation for rehab within 2 years, or a gravel surface badly deteriorated or serious surface deformation. or Significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Primarily 3-R; a portion of the project addresses serious foundation problems. or Moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Primarily major reconstruction; addresses longer-range rehabilitation. or No w/g/a deficiencies.	N/A	N/A
11. Cost, length, AADT evaluation. Divide project cost (in thousands) by length (in miles) and further divide result by Avg. Annual Daily Traffic. Weighting: 4	Between: $0 - 55\phi = 5$ $55\phi - 80\phi = 4$	Between: 80¢ - \$1.10 = 3 \$1.10 - \$1.50 = 2 \$1.50 - \$2.50 = 1	Between: \$2.50 - \$3.00 = 0	Between: \$3.00 - \$4.00 = -1 \$4.00 - \$6.00 = -2 \$6.00 - \$10.00 = 3	Between: \$10.00 - \$54.00 = -4 \$54.00 - ∞ = -5

Urban and Rural	Projects Criteria				
	r rojecto criteria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
11. Cost, length,			miles) and further divide		
AADT evaluation.			based on cost evaluatior		
			e would be 5 projects per	bin.) Each succeeding	bin gets 1 less point,
Weighting: 4	from +5 to -5. Least ex	pensive bin gets +5 poir	nts.		
12. Deficient	Deficient bridge(s)	Deficient bridge(s)	No bridge	N/A	N/A
bridges?	needing	eligible for	deficiencies		
Weighting: 3	replacement*.	rehabilitation**.			
* "Eligible for r	eplacement" means the b	ridge has a sufficiency r	ating of less than 50 poir	nts and has been determ	ined to be
	placement by ADOT&PF				
	<i>ehabilitation</i> " means the b		ating between 50 and 80	points and has been de	etermined to be eligible
	tion by ADOT&PF Bridge		3	•	· ·
13. ^b Deficient	Significantly deficient	Moderately deficient	No w/g/a	N/A	N/A
width/grade/	w/g/a relative to	w/g/a relative to	deficiencies.		
alignment	standards.	standards.			
Weighting: 3					
Question #13 to be n	nerged with question #10.	All following questions	shall be renumbered in f	inal draft.	
14. Functional	Major Arterial = 5	Major Collector or	Minor Collector N/A	Minor Collector = -3	Local Roads/Streets
class.	Minor Arterial = 4	Urban Collector = 3		Local Roads/Streets	or Unclassified= -5
Weighting: 2 5					NA
15. Other factors	Project exhibits	Project exhibits	Project exhibits no	N/A	N/A
not specified.	significant innovation,	moderate innovation,	innovation, creativity		
'	creativity or unique	creativity or unique	or unique benefits not		
	benefits not	benefits not	otherwise rated.		
Weighting: 2	otherwise rated.	otherwise rated.			
15. Other factors	Each PEB member Is a	allocated 2 points for each	h project scored.	Negative points may b	e assigned to projects
not specified.		y be allocated to each p		that are excessive in s	
.,		Remote, Rural/Urban an		not in state's interest.	, ,
Weighting: 2		ed for projects within the			

Total Weight = 47

TRAAK Projects Criteria									
			Scoring Criteria						
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)				

Please note: The maximum financial size of the TRAAK Program was reduced by statute (AS 19.15.025) and as a consequence no project nominations will be considered for the 2006 - 2008 STIP. All funds directed to TRAAK program will apply to projects that are already underway and the earliest that further nominations for TRAAK will be consider Is two years hence for the 2008-2010 STIP. Some changes are being proposed to these criteria to keep them consistent with other STIP categories.

these chiena to keep then	i consistent with other s	rir categories.	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
1. Health and quality	This project provides	This project provides a	Project will have no	This project provides	This project provides
of life	a significant	moderate contribution	effect either positive or	a moderate	a significant
Air and water quality,	contribution to	to improved health or	negative on quality of	degradation to	degradation to
neighborhood continuity,	improved health or	quality of life through	life issues.	health or quality of	health or quality of
enhanced recreational	quality of life through	reduction or removal		life.	life.
opportunities, enhanced	reduction or removal	of existing negative			
understanding of natural	of existing negative	factor or provision of a			
and manmade	factor or provision of	new facility that			
environment.	a new facility that	improves quality of			
	improves quality of	life.			
Weighting: 4	life.				
2. Safety.	Addresses	Addresses	Project does not have a	Project will have a	Project will have a
	demonstrated safety	demonstrated safety	safety component.	minor adverse effect	major adverse effect
	problem of	problem of moderate		on safety.	on safety.
	significance.	nature or there is a			
		record of public			
Weighting: 5		concern.			
3a. Local, other agency	Contributions covers	Note: award 1 point	No contribution.	N/A	N/A
or user contribution to	25% or more of	for each 5%			
fund capital costs	project costs.	contribution.			
excluding land.	Note: award 1 point				
	for each 5%				
Weighting: 4	contribution.				
3b. Local, other agency	Contribution of land	Contribution of land for	Public agency provides	N/A	N/A
or user contribution of	for entire facility, plus	less than entire facility	land already dedicated		
land to project.	change of land status	plus permanent	for project: 2 pts.		
	to permanently	dedication: points			
	dedicate land for	proportionate to land			
Weighting: 4	project.	contributed for project.			

3 a & 3b: Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required contribution shall be considered.

TRAAK Projects Crit	eria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
4a. Local, other agency	Sponsor will assume	Sponsor will assume	Sponsor contributes	N/A	N/A
or user contribution to	ownership of	full M&O responsibility	nothing.		
assume ownership,	DOT&PF facility; or	of DOT&PF facility; or			
including operations &	sponsor will assume	sponsor will assume			
maintenance costs	ownership of another	full M&O of another			
(DOT facilities).	DOT&PF facility of	DOT&PF facility of			
Weighting: 4	similar M&O cost.	similar M&O cost.			
Commitment must be in w				1	
4b. Local, other agency	Sponsor will assume	Sponsor will assume	Continued sponsor	Sponsor assumes	Sponsor assumes
or user contribution to	ownership of and	full M&O responsibility	ownership & operation	ownership, but not	neither ownership
fund operations and	maintenance	(but not ownership); or	of locally-owned facility	M&O responsibility	nor M&O
maintenance (O&M)	responsibility for new	sponsor will assume	= 2 pts.; and results in		responsibility
costs. (Use for non-	facility.	full M&O of another	significant local		
DOT facilities).		DOT&PF facility of	maintenance savings =		
Weighting: 3		similar M&O cost	3 pts.		
5. Public support.	Preponderance of	Majority of public	Public record is divided	Majority of public	Preponderance of
	public record	record shows support	or undocumented	record shows	public record shows
	including a resolution	for project and fully	toward project	opposition to project;	opposition to project
	from the local elected	supported in official		and not supported in	including a
	body shows support	State, local or Federal		official State, local or	resolution from the
	for project and fully	plans (4); or nominally		Federal plans.	local elected body
	supported in official	supported in official			and contravenes
	State, local or	State, local or Federal			official State, local or
Weighting: 4	Federal plans.	plans (3).			Federal plans.
6. Project bridges gap	Project provides an	Project provides a	No gaps bridged or a	Project creates	N/A
or removes barrier	important connection	modest connection.	barrier removed but	barrier or displaces	
between existing trail	(bridges gap,	(bridges gap, removes	does connect to	existing non-	
systems or provides	removes barrier or	barrier or provides	existing networks.	motorized uses.	
interpretive center or	provides interp. or	interp. or rest area			
rest area continuity.	rest area continuity).	continuity).			
Weighting: 2 3					
7. Project is tied to an	Event or activity is of	Event or activity is	Event is minor and	N/A	N/A
annual recreational,	statewide or regional	local and well	local.		
educational or tourism	significance and well	known/long standing.			
event or activity? This	known/long standing.	Yes to both (3) or yes			
project would strongly	Yes to both (5), yes	to one (2). Event is			
support/sustain this	to one (4).	new but growing in			
event/?		importance (1).			
Weighting: 2					

TRAAK Projects Crit	teria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
8. Any of the six intrinsic qualities: scenic, historic, cultural, natural, archaeological, recreational. Weighting: 3	One point for each qua Project must include in cultural, natural and ard for points.	terpretation of historic,	None.	N/A	N/A
9. Project includes Stabilization or renovation of a historic property related to transportation Weighting: 4	Nomination includes letter or other documentation of inclusion of the renovated property on the National Historic Register.	Nomination includes letter of support from Office of History & Archeology that declares the property to be of significant (4 or 3), or of moderate (2 or 1) historical importance.	Project does not include stabilization or renovation of a historic property.	N/A	Project will harm or reduce in value an historic property.
10. Capital cost Weighting: 4 5	Total project cost (all phases): \$250,000 or less = 5	Total project cost (all phases): \$250,000-\$500,000 = 3	Total project cost (all phases): \$500,000-\$750,000 = 1 \$750,000 or more = 0	N/A	N/A
11. Other factors not specified. Weighting: 2	Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	N/A	N/A
11. Other factors not specified. Weighting: 2	Each PEB member Is a Between 0-5 points ma	allocated 2 points for each by be allocated to each pr mote, Rural/Urban and o	Negative points may projects that are exce deemed not in state's	essive in scope, cost or	

Total Weight = 47

Transit Projects (Criteria				
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. Health and	Project provides	Project provides	Project will have no	Project provides a	Project provides a
quality of life	significant	moderate contribution	effect, either positive	moderate	significant
(Neighborhood	contribution to	to improved health or	or negative, on	degradation to health	degradation to health
continuity, access to	improved health or	quality of life.	quality of life issues.	or quality of life.	or quality of life.
basic necessities)	quality of life.				
Weighting: 3					
2. Safety.	Addresses	Addresses	Project has no effect	N/A	N/A-
	demonstrated safety	demonstrated safety	on safety.		
	problem of	problem of moderate			
	significance.	nature or there is a			
		record of public			
Weighting: 4		concern.			
2. Safety.	Strongly addresses a	Addresses	No record of safety	N/A	N/A
	significant and	demonstrated	issues addressed by		
	existing safety	existing safety	project or it is not		
14/ 1/1/ 0	problem.	problem of moderate	primary purpose of		
Weighting: 2		nature.	project.		
	ore deaths or major injuri				
3. Improves	Greatly improves	Moderately improves	Minimal to no effect	Moderately	Greatly decreases
intermodal	connectivity between	connectivity between	on transportation	decreases the	the connectivity
transportation or	modes and coordination and	modes and coordination and	system connectivity, or coordination and	connectivity between	between modes or coordination and
reduces redundant facilities.	integration of	integration of	integration of	modes, or decreases coordination and	integration of
iaciilles.	passenger systems	passenger systems	passenger systems	integration of	passenger systems,
	and/or would clearly	and/or would clearly	and services, and	passenger systems	and/or results in
	reduce the need for	reduce the need for	does not change the	and services and/or	redundant
	significant capital	capital investment in	requirement for	results in redundant	investments.
	investment in another	another mode.	investment in other	investments.	investments.
Weighting: 2 3	mode.	anound mode.	modes.	mivedinente.	
4. Local, other	Contribution of state ma	atch design right-of-	Contribution covers	N/A	N/A
agency or user	way, and/or materials:		no capital costs;	,	,
contribution to fund	each 5 20% of project of		contributes nothing.		
capital costs.	required match.				
Weighting: 5	7				
	te match policy shall not t	ne considered In this que	stion Only contribution	s that exceed the require	d match contribution

Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered.

Transit Projects Criteria						
	Scoring Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)	
5. Local contribution to fund operations and maintenance (O&M) costs. Weighing: 5	Local or user contributions cover 100% of O&M costs, and includes ownership of facility.	One point for each 20% of local support of O&M costs.	Local or user contributions cover none of O&M costs.	N/A	N/A	
6. Public support. Weighting: 3	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official state/local plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project; and nominally supported in official state/local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official state/local plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and contravenes official state/local plans.	
7. Environmental approval readiness. Weighting: 1	Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion or already complete.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment or draft document circulated.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval extremely difficult 50/50 chance.	Environmental approval unlikely.	
8. System continuity and maintenance (vehicles). Weighting: 4	Project replaces currently operating vehicles that are at or beyond FTA replacement standards.	Project provides vehicles to expand service.	Vehicles will neither replace currently operating vehicles nor expand service.	N/A	N/A	
9. Is the project listed in State Air Quality Implementation Plan? Weighting: 2	Yes, a required element.	Yes, a contingency element = 4. No, but qualifies for CMAQ funds = 2-3.	Not listed in plan; does not qualify for CMAQ funds; no significant air quality impacts.	No, and project will have moderate negative air quality impacts.	No, and project will have significant negative air quality impacts.	
10. Has local agency exhausted FTA/ other funding sources? Weighting: 3	Yes, including filing of FTA 5309 application.	Yes, excluding FTA 5309 funding.	No, but FTA funding unlikely.	No, and FTA funding a possibility.	No, and FTA funding a strong possibility.	
11. Does project support private-non- profit (PNP) providers? Weighting: 4	Yes, will replace existing PNP agency vehicle, which scored above 90 on FTA 5310 ranking.	Yes, new vehicle for PNP provider that scored above 90 on FTA 5310 ranking.	No.	N/A	N/A	

Transit Projects Criteria							
			Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)		
12. Will project support coordinated service or brokerage? Weighting: 4 5	Yes, with 5 or more agencies participating.	Yes, with 3 agencies participating.	No.	No, even though coordinated system/brokerage is in operation in community.	N/A		
13. Increased mobility for the disadvantaged. Weighting: 5	Increased mobility for elderly, persons with disabilities, or economically disadvantaged is major benefit of project; and/or necessary for existing facility or system to comply with ADA.	Increased mobility for elderly, persons with disabilities, or economically disadvantaged is moderate benefit of project.	Meets ADA requirements but has limited benefits for mobility disadvantaged.	Will require substantial cost to meet ADA requirements.	No intention/ impossible to meet ADA requirements.		
13. Other factors not specified. Weighting: 2	Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	N/A	N/A		
13. Other factors not specified. Weighting: 2	Each PEB member Is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Transit, Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.			Negative points may be that are excessive in sense not in state's interest.			

Maximum Weight: 47

Intelligent Transp	Intelligent Transportation System Projects Pre-Screening Criteria						
Standards	Yes	No					
A. Clear and complete project and operational plan definition? Yes/No	Project implementation and operation plan clearly defined. (Yes; project may proceed to B.)	Project implementation and operation plan inadequate. (No; project not eligible for consideration.)	N/A	N/A	N/A		
B. Project fulfills Alaska and National ITS Architecture? Yes/No	Project is clearly defined to fully conform to Alaska and National ITS architecture. (Yes; project may proceed to C.)	Project not defined to meet Alaska and National ITS architecture. (No; project not eligible for consideration.)	N/A	N/A	N/A		
C. Project adheres to NTCIP* requirements? (Unless legacy systems prevent such requirement.) Yes/No	Project documentation clearly identifies all NTCIP requirements and is designed to meet them. (Yes; project may proceed to scoring.)	Vague identification of NTCIP requirements or no indication that they will be conformed to. (No; project not eligible for consideration.)	N/A	N/A	N/A		

^{*}NTCIP = "National Transportation Communication for ITS Protocols."

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria							
			Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)		
1. Fosters department's mission and goals defined in ITS Plan? (Efficiency and reliability; safety & Homeland Security; quality of life; and, multimodal mobility.) Weighting: 10	Strongly supports three or more of the key goals defined in ITS Strategy.	Strongly supports two of the key goals defined in ITS Strategy.	Support of key goals is minimal, speculative or temporary.	N/A	N/A		
2. Enhances the department's operating budget. Weighting: 5	Project provides a significant contribution to department operating budget (>250,000)	Project provides a moderate contribution to department operating budget (\$150,000)	Project will have no or minimal effect on department budget. (\$50,000)	This project will cause the department to incur significant new costs not offset by savings, revenue or avoided costs.	N/A		

Intelligent Transp	ortation System Pro	ojects Criteria			
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
3. Integration within department ITS Plan? Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	N/A	N/A
4. Integration external to department including other agencies and/or private sector. Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	N/A	N/A
5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund project development. Weighting: 3	Contribution of state match, design, right-of - way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5 20% of project cost. Maximum=20 5.	Contribution of state match, design, right-of - way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5 20% of project cost.	Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
6. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&O costs. (For non- DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership).	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing. Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
Weighting: 3			ation Only and other times	that are and the many in	al man tala an metrila esti a m
shall be considered.	e match policy shall not b	e considerea in this que	stion. Unly contributions	s tnat exceed the require	a match contribution
7. Magnitude of project costs including capital and operating. (Include allied projects in cost calculation.) Weighting: 5	Project cost of less than \$1 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$3 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$5 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$5 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$10 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.
8. Sustainability of technology involved. Weighting: 5	Project relies on technology proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of long-term project success is very high.	Project relies on technology used but not considered proven sustainable in Alaskan circum-stances. Chance of project long-term project success is moderately high.	Project relies on technology yet unproven in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project success unknown.	N/A	N/A

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria							
			Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)		
9. Multi-use potential.	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project	Little or no ITS expansion potential offered by this project.	N/A	N/A		
Weighting: 5	significantly.	moderately.					
10. Time to completion. Weighting: 3	Project implementation likely <18 months.	Project implementation >18 months, but <36 months.	Project implementation >36 months.	N/A	N/A		
11. Geographic extent. Weighting: 2	Project beneficiaries in all three regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in at least two regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in only one region or community.	N/A	N/A		

Maximum weight = 47